

State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training
(SLATT) Program

The Emergence of
Special-Interest/Single-Issue Terrorism

by
William Dyson

Presented by

IIR

Institute for Intergovernmental Research
Tallahassee, Florida

The Emergence of Special-Interest/Single-Issue Terrorism

by William Dyson

Over the past decade, so called “special-interest” or “single-issue” terrorism has become the most common form of violent political extremism expressed in the United States and in most of the industrialized nations of the world. Several hundred acts of terrorism have been perpetrated by special-interest/single-issue activists in the United States alone during the past ten years.¹ These attacks have ranged from fairly minimal vandalism incidents to significant acts of destructiveness that have resulted in millions of dollars in damages. While most of these incidents have targeted property rather than people, some attacks in the area of antiabortion have clearly been intended to kill and maim abortion providers and their associates.² Furthermore, some of the property attacks perpetrated by the broad spectrum of special-interest/single-issue activists have, in fact, resulted in situations wherein emergency workers and innocent bystanders could have been hurt or killed. This has been particularly true in attacks that have employed incendiaries and explosives. Even in vandalism-type situations, unintended injuries can occur. Such was the case on May 8, 1987, when a blade in a sawmill exploded while cutting through a log in which a spike had been placed. A mill worker, George Alexander, 23, was severely cut and almost bled to death.³ In the latter 1990s, one animal rights group sent razor blades to targeted individuals. Although these blades were not adulterated with toxins, as the group implied, they nonetheless could have resulted in injury had the letters not been opened with care.⁴ In England during 2000-2001, corporate executives and others involved with animals have been attacked both physically and through the use of antipersonnel devices, such as letter bombs and car bombs.⁵ This could be a precursor for what the future holds for United States animal activism. Despite their statements to the contrary, United States-based animal and environmental extremists appear to be moving towards a philosophy that harm to individuals can be accepted in the interests of the greater good.

Special-interest/single-issue terrorism involves the use of extreme force and violence for the purpose of coercing a government and/or population to modify its behavior with respect to a specific area of concern. These extremists do not have an overall political agenda. More often than not, special-interest/single-issue extremists do not seek the overthrow of a government or even a major alteration in the manner in which it operates or in the manner in which the people live. Instead, their intention is to force the government and population to change its direction in line with the philosophy of the extremist with respect to a specific subject. In many instances, the overall philosophical cause of the special-interest/single-issue terrorist is fairly popular with the citizens. Therefore, rather than attempting to “educate” the public about the topic, the clandestine terrorist’s emphasis is more towards coercing and forcing the people to take a desired action. The terrorist seeks immediate change, and refuses to wait for a legislative process to bring about the desired end. The intention of the terrorist is to exert intense pressure on the people, the specific target, and the government in an attempt to make them quickly alter policies and procedures.⁶

Some special-interest/single-issue extremists have fairly narrow goals, while others follow much broader agendas within their overall cause. As an example, one environmental activist might make a concerted effort to saving a particular river from pollution, while another environmental extremist may take actions designed to save all rivers from pollution or to eliminate pollution in general. The two most prolific extremist groups, the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and the Earth Liberation Front (ELF), tend to take a sweeping approach and attack a diverse variety of targets relating to their agendas.⁷ Some special-interest/single-issue programs are also planks included within the overall philosophical agendas of broader left- or right-wing organizations and international terrorist groups. However, this should not be misconstrued to suggest that the special-interest/single-issue groups and the broader issue organizations will support each other. A left- or right-wing group may participate in a special-interest/single-issue protest activity in an effort to recruit people or somehow exploit the situation to their advantage; however, the reverse is much less likely to occur. As an example, a right-wing, white-supremacist group might openly oppose abortion because they want to see more white children born. Conceivably, such a group might even attack an abortion clinic, as was the case with right-wing extremist Eric Robert Rudolph.⁸ However, this would not mean that antiabortion special-interest/single-issue advocates, either overt or covert, would ally with this white-supremacist group, participate in one of their rallies, or commit a terrorist attack on non-whites or some other target of that group.

The Nature of the Special-Interest/Single-Issue Threat

The major special-interest/single-issue extremist political causes in the United States at the onset of the 21st century fall into the areas of animal rights, environmental protection, antigenetic research, and antiabortion.⁹ It is obvious that there is some possible overlap, especially in the former three issues. Some environmentalists or “eco-activists,” clearly view animals as part of the environment and, therefore, support protection of animals as part of their overall agenda. Similarly, animal activists, particularly those addressing endangered species, will have specific concerns for any action that threatens the natural environment in which animals live. ALF and ELF have a close alliance—they have conducted operations together, and have issued joint communiqués.¹⁰ Antigenetic activists believe that gene-alteration projects threaten both the environment and animal life through the creation of “Franken-Animals” and “Franken-Plants.” Similarly, many animal and eco-activists are also fearful of genetic research of any kind. ELF claimed credit for several attacks that were clearly antigenetic engineering in nature.¹¹ Even some antiabortion extremists are taking a jaundiced view of genetic engineering projects that they believe could lead to man attempting to “engineer” human embryos and the creation of clones.¹² However, there have not been any “joint” terrorist operations involving antiabortion and antigenetic engineering extremists to date.

There are other issues of interest that are clearly on the immediate horizon, and that are already being championed to certain degrees by broader left-wing and right-wing groups, and some current overt special-interest/single-issue organizations. These issues

are related to antitechnology/anticomputer, antiglobalization, anti-immigration, and land use/property rights.

Clandestine terrorist groups that perpetrate forceful and illegal actions on behalf of special-interest/single-issue causes usually do not spontaneously spring out of thin air. Violent political extremist groups are usually preceded by overt activists who attempt to engender support for the philosophical concept through legitimate constitutionally protected actions, such as picketing, demonstrating, leafleting, petitioning, letter writing, and lobbying. Those who become engaged in covert activities may or may not have been involved in such a surface movement. Regardless, they believe that the progress being made through legal means to achieve the ultimate objective is simply not fast enough and must be hastened by the engenderment of fear. The fact that clandestine groups emerge does not preclude legitimate surface organizations from continuing. Indeed, most people involved in the overt movement do not condone the violent activity and many openly condemn it. The overt antiabortion movement exemplifies this.

During recent years, the more prominent surface special-interest/single-issue causes have come together during certain demonstrations in order to benefit from the strength that numbers give to each represented movement. They have been joined by a variety of smaller, lesser-known special-interest/single-issue causes and, in some instances, by mainstream groups, to include civil rights organizations, labor unions, and left- and right-wing movements. Such was the case in Seattle, Washington, during anti-World Trade Organization demonstrations in December 1999; in Washington, DC, in connection with World Bank and International Monetary Fund protests during April 2000; and in conjunction with both the 2000 Democratic and Republican National Conventions. These types of informal and de facto coalitions have continued in 2001, in association with world economic meetings held in the United States and elsewhere.

The Issue of Anarchy

A current phenomena that must be addressed is anarchy. This term traces its heritage to Hellenic origins and implies that there be “no rule.” Specifically, it means the absence of any form of political authority and is derived from two Greek words, “an”—without and “arkhos”—ruler.¹³ Although anarchy as a movement dates back to at least the 18th century with the French Revolution and has garnered heavy support from the working class in the past, anarchists have probably never before had more potential for exerting influence on the overall population than they do at the onset of the 21st century. In general, anarchists oppose the rule of one person over another. For some anarchists, this means no government at all and requires the virtual destruction of any vestige of a ruling body. For others, it implies a state of rule in which everyone is equal—perhaps a kind of voluntary government. Still, others are reactionary and seek to return to a former time in which they believe government was less restrictive and when each man was largely on his own. By its very nature, anarchy suggests disorganization. Consequently, the idea of a massive, structured anarchist group or anarchist political movement developing under a single leader or ruling council is unlikely.

Modern anarchist philosophy comes in many forms in the industrialized world. Some anarchists follow the writings of a specific philosopher, such as John Zerzan of Eugene, Oregon, while others adhere to a more eclectic path, taking thoughts from a variety of viewpoints. Some people calling themselves anarchists seem to destroy for the sheer love of destroying! Generally, anarchists oppose any capitalist form of government and stress equality among all people. They preach self-management and voluntary cooperation among individuals. They oppose globalization. The very idea of some form of world government or universal economic policy having control over masses of people is repulsive to anarchists. They oppose usury and just about anything else that would cause one person to be able to exert control over others.

Many anarchists have encompassed into their philosophy desires to protect animals and the environment. A vegetarian lifestyle is popular among modern anarchists. A good number are also opposed to the “evils of modern technology” and believe that genetic engineering is wrong. Some want to get away from the masses and form utopian-like communities, usually in rural areas where they can create a self-sufficient lifestyle. Holding such beliefs, it is certainly logical that anarchists would support animal rights, antigenetic engineering, and environmental causes and would join with members of groups associated with these movements in protests and demonstrations. Some may even become involved in clandestine activities in conjunction with these causes. During the summer of 2001, ELF released a video intended to promote their environmental cause and recruit new members.¹⁴ An “anticapitalism” theme is apparent in this video, which suggests that at least some members of ELF may have a broader agenda than would be expected from a special-interest/single-issue extremist.

Gentrification has become a major issue for many anarchists. The idea of wealthy people or the government pushing people out of their homes in order to rebuild and “improve” a neighborhood is abhorrent to them. For this reason they will express opposition, possibly even through violence, against financial institutions, government agencies, builders, and investors who engage in gentrification. Further, they despise businesses, such as Starbucks Coffee, banks, and other financial institutions, which, they believe, capitalize on such rebuilding endeavors. Any entity perceived as being associated with gentrification can become a target of attack during a protest demonstration.

It has not been easy to categorize anarchy along with normally accepted classifications of extremist political philosophy. Many believe that anarchists are left wing in nature and, therefore, should be classified with socialists and communists. However, not all anarchists are willing to accept this, and some find fault with socialist philosophy. Others point out that some current anarchists espouse ideas that are similar to that of the 1970s Posse Comitatus movement, which has traditionally been characterized as being extreme right wing in direction. Others feel more comfortable describing anarchy as being special-interest/single-issue in nature. Problems arise with this latter premise because most anarchists have views on a wide variety of subjects, ranging from the environment to the economy, and really do not focus solely on a single topic. “Bringing down a government” is much too broad an objective to qualify a

proponent as being “special interest/single issue” in political orientation. It is probably best to examine the specific philosophies promulgated by each anarchist group in order to best classify where it belongs along the spectrum of political philosophy. Many anarchists are so opposed to structure that they would likely be against their philosophy even being classified.

During the past several years in both Europe and the United States, anarchists have helped to transform lawful protest demonstrations into riots in which significant property damages have occurred. Functioning in so-called “black blocs”—alliances formulated for particular protests—anarchists have capitalized on the masses of participants from various causes, including special-interest/single-issue groups, to initiate violent attacks against law enforcement, the government, banking, and big business. Many of these riots have arisen from demonstrations against economic conferences, biotechnology sessions, and gatherings of world leaders, including G-8 meetings. Often, the anarchists foment attacks on police by throwing bottles and debris and committing both random and planned acts of vandalism against business targets. When the authorities respond with tear gas, water cannons, and sheer shows of force, some anarchists break away from the crowd, and engage in acts of sabotage and more serious vandalism. Frequently, as the vandalism begins and police react, other protesters will also join in the confusion and openly resist the police and engage in destructive acts. When engaged in illegal actions, anarchists will often attire themselves in black and wear hoods, masks, or other disguises to conceal their identities. Otherwise, when with crowds, they wear similar clothing to that worn by everyone else, so authorities cannot readily identify their political affiliation. Despite the fact that most anarchists abhor the very concept of organization, when it comes to protest violence, many will work together, at least during a particular event. Often, they will devote considerable effort to pre-planning actions they intend to “spontaneously” commit during the course of a demonstration.¹⁵

In addition to actions taken during demonstrations, there is evidence that some anarchists have also engaged in violent covert terrorist acts and are likely to commit more of these actions. One self-described anarchist, Jeffrey Michael Luers, was convicted on June 5, 2001, of arson in connection with a clandestine attack on a car dealership in Eugene, Oregon, on June 16, 2000, wherein \$40,000 in damages resulted. He was also convicted in conjunction with the attempted arson of a fuel tank truck on May 27, 2000. In November 2000, a fellow anarchist, Craig Andrew Marshall, pleaded guilty to conspiracy in conjunction with the June 2000 car dealership arson.¹⁶ People associated with Luers are suspected in an arson attack at the same car dealership on March 30, 2001, which caused almost one million dollars in damages. A communiqué from an anonymous group claiming credit for the most recent attack was released through the ELF press office in Portland, Oregon; however, ELF did not claim any involvement.¹⁷

Identifying the Problems Associated with Special-Interest/Single-Issue Terrorism

The very fact that most special-interest/single-issue terrorist attacks committed in the name of animal rights, protection of the environment, and in opposition to genetic engineering over the past two decades have not been solved demonstrates that the law enforcement community has yet to develop an effective program to address such crimes. Although most antiabortion murderers have been identified, many clinic arsons, bombings, and vandalisms remain unsolved. There are a variety of possible reasons for these failings. One of the most troublesome has been the reluctance of some law enforcement and governmental agencies to view the problems as terrorist in nature. Addressing the crimes and not the motives has made these cases difficult to solve and has largely negated the use of conspiracy statutes. Because many of these crimes involve property damage without harm to humans, prosecutors do not view these cases as high priority. Inasmuch as the causes the crimes are tied to are usually popular, investigators frequently experience less than total support from the community.

Many special-interest/single-issue groups preach “leaderless resistance.” Essentially, they encourage people who accept their political agenda to commit, on their own, crimes that support the cause. Such crimes are extremely difficult for law enforcement to solve. The various groups also emphasize security and ensure that their members not only practice it, but also are well aware of how law enforcement operates. The average political extremist knows more about police investigative techniques than the common criminal. Clandestine political extremists very often have a network of supporters who will assist them in connection with violent operations and after they have been arrested.

Addressing the Problems Presented by Special-Interest/Single-Issue Terrorism

Law enforcement agencies must abandon the “it cannot happen here” concept and realize that no part of the country is immune to special-interest/single-issue terrorist attacks. Prior to the advent of modern communication, terrorist attacks were often executed in populated areas in order to achieve wide publicity for the cause. Today the whole world can learn of an attack almost instantly, regardless of where it occurs. All law enforcement agencies must be aware of the threat that political terrorists can present to their community, and they should prepare for a response to such an assault. A good way to achieve this is for agencies to identify potential targets within their jurisdiction and to make contact with the proprietors of these locations. At the very least, agencies can create specific response plans that can be employed should an attack occur at logical locations within their jurisdiction. Targets could include college and private laboratories; any entity that raises, houses, or uses animals; any company that has been accused of pollution or otherwise damaging the environment; any farmer raising genetically modified crops or animals; and any large corporation that has come under attack during antiglobalization protests. With respect to antiabortion single-issue terrorism, any abortion clinic, abortion doctor, or hospital that performs abortions could be a logical target of violent extremists.

An effort must be made to develop training for law enforcement investigators and administrators with respect to special-interest/single-issue groups. It is important that firefighters also be included in such training sessions. Agencies need to know the philosophies and targets of these groups, and they should be aware of how they operate. Despite the fact that a large number of special-interest/single-issue terrorist attacks have not been solved and that most clandestine members of these groups have yet to be identified, there are, nonetheless, specific and identifiable tactics that these groups employ that can be included in police training sessions. Community officials and law enforcement agencies must be willing to recognize that they have a current problem or a potential threat with respect to special-interest/single-issue terrorism.

When someone is arrested in connection with a terrorist attack or during the course of a violent demonstration, law enforcement agencies should make a logical effort to check that person's background. Some individuals, particularly those detained for violating laws during protests, have criminal backgrounds in their state of residence or other cities. Such knowledge could prevent these people from being given minimal bonds or being treated as "first offenders" with respect to prosecution. Adoption of a "zero-tolerance" policy, for both terrorist actions and criminal offenses conducted during overt protest demonstrations, can yield excellent results in the battle against terrorism.

Intelligence gathering is one of the prime vehicles that law enforcement agencies can employ to counter special-interest/single-issue terrorist organizations. Internet sites, including chat rooms, can yield a great deal of information. The sharing of information among law enforcement agencies is another important tool that can be used to combat terrorism. Most special-interest/single-issue terrorists seem to be quite mobile. If agencies working against these groups do not share their intelligence, no one will be able to counter many of these extremists as they move around the country.

The Issue of Violent Protest Demonstrations

The use of demonstrations to engender support for political, social, labor, or other causes is certainly not novel to the 21st century. However, the potential for great property damage and injury to innocent people probably has never been greater than it is today. The antiwar protests of the Vietnam War era of the 1960s and 1970s often resulted in violence and property damage. However, modern technology has made it possible for considerably greater problems to arise from similar forms of protest during the 21st century. Recent demonstrations against economic conferences and in opposition to gatherings of world leaders have shown that huge numbers of people can be gathered from all over the country, and even from outside the country, as a result of modern transportation and communication. Organizers of such protests have learned well from the demonstrations of the past four decades.

Protest demonstrations are lawful in nature and are protected by the United States Constitution. Law enforcement obviously has an obligation to afford protection to the community, including those citizens engaging in lawful protest actions. There is a very

thin line that law enforcement officers must walk with respect to intelligence gathering. The mere fact that a protest involves an unpopular cause or is in direct opposition to the government does not justify a police agency investigating the participants. Organizers of the more violent protests are well aware of the investigative limitations faced by police and will utilize this to their advantage.

Special-interest/single-issue causes commonly employ a variety of overt protest activities, ranging from demonstrations to letter-writing campaigns. The vast majority of these activities are lawful and unworthy of law enforcement investigation. However, during the end of the 20th century, extremist members of some of these causes have, on occasion, joined in much broader protest demonstrations involving such issues as globalization and the economy. Some of these demonstrations have become violent and destructive. The trend of special-interest/single-issue activists participating in such mass protests is likely to continue. Even if these people do not engage in illegal actions themselves, their sheer numbers provide anarchists and more violent people a form of “shield” behind which they can foment destructive actions.

Concluding Remarks

The modern world is rapidly evolving. Indeed, it is likely that the past millennium has seen more changes than any similar period in all of history. These changes have enabled people to communicate with one another more effectively. Transportation has improved to the extent that travel can be made within the same day to just about anywhere in the country, regardless of the place of origin. Modern weaponry bears little in common with that of even 100 years ago. Advances in technology have made it possible for a relative handful of individuals to wreak havoc, killing thousands of people and causing multimillions of dollars in damages. Such would have been impossible for anything short of a military unit during most of history. All of these advancements have allowed terrorism to become the serious threat that it is today. Presently, virtually anyone who has a grievance can find similar-minded people. If angry enough, the person can perpetrate violent attacks through knowledge that he can gain through modern communication, and he can quickly announce to the whole world what he has done. Furthermore, he can quickly travel where necessary to perpetrate a political action.

Ironically, some of the very advances that have made terrorism such a threat in the modern world have also given rise to the political causes on which some terrorist movements have developed. The advancements in transportation and communication have brought the world closer together, thereby creating the current issue of globalization that many extremists oppose. The needs of 21st century business, combined with advances in modern transportation and technology, have led to pollution and incursions on pristine lands. This has resulted in the development of groups that seek to protect the environment and animals. Modern science’s use of animals for research, and its experiments with genes, has given rise to activist groups wanting to protect the animals and counter genetically altered products. Of course, modern science has also developed

some of the modern weaponry that terrorists can employ. Rapid changes in society have caused a multitude of ethical, moral, and religious issues that demand attention. Violent activists have seized on some of these questions and attempted to force their viewpoints on the public. The sheer size of government at all levels has caused many people to become alienated and feel that their views can never be considered by the officials responsible for running the city, county, state, and country. Some individuals, like the anarchists, want to eliminate virtually all forms of government and either do without or replace the current system with simpler, more tribal, or more communal forms of leadership.

Fortunately, the very advances in just about every facet of life that have occurred during the past several decades have also had positive effects on law enforcement. Advances in communication have made it much easier for police agencies to develop, store, and use intelligence information. However, many agencies have not been able to fully capitalize on many of these new developments and are, therefore, not realizing the full benefits that modern technology offers. There has never been a time in history where a law enforcement officer has been able to glean more information from a crime scene. Modern science makes it possible for investigators to do things that were little more than scientific dreams just 50 years ago. Sadly, law enforcement has not been able to keep abreast of the advances. As a result, some modern tools, such as the computer, are not being utilized as effectively as possible against terrorists. Laws have also not kept current with the changes taking place. Consequently, investigators sometimes are unable to adequately address some terrorist-related situations because of the lack of criminal statutes concerning the problem.

If the threat presented by special-interest/single-issue terrorists is to be successfully met, the law enforcement community must develop a cooperative posture in addressing the problem. An agency with national jurisdiction, like the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), must function as a kind of umbrella to ensure that information is shared and to bring the logical agencies together. Federal agencies and state, county, and local law enforcement units must work together. It is important that intelligence be shared and that investigations be conducted jointly by affected agencies. Prosecutions must be conducted with the idea of stopping the problem and not just applying a “band-aid” to it. Large-scale conspiracy charges are often more effective than single counts, unless the single charge involves murder, kidnapping, or something of a similar serious nature. Agencies must realize that anyplace in the country can be a target for special-interest/single-issue extremists. No longer can a local law enforcement agency assume that terrorists will only attack in heavily populated areas. Since extremists are highly mobile, no agency can hope to handle or defeat the problem in a vacuum.

Endnotes

¹ ALF and ELF, who prefer not to characterize their clandestine attacks as “terrorist,” publish lists of hundreds of attacks perpetrated by their organizations and cause-related groups over the past decade via their Web sites, www.animalliberation.net/doa/ and www.earthliberationfront.com/doa/, *Diary of Actions* sections. The National Animal Interest Alliance, www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/archives/arterror.htm,

also publishes a list of attacks carried out by animal activists during the past five years. The Genetix Alert Press Office, www.tao.ca/~ban/ar.htm, publishes a list of recent antigenetic engineering attacks, as does a group calling itself Vandalwatch, www.cffar.org/vandalwatch/chronology/2000.html. The U.S. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, publishes a list of arson and bombing attacks that occurred against abortion providers between 1982 and 1998. The National Abortion Federation, http://209.9.126.227/NAFweb/Violence/Chron_Arson.asp, maintains an up-to-date list of abortion attacks that reflects over 100 incidents during the past decade.

² In 1993, the National Abortion Federation began publishing a list of doctors and abortion clinic personnel who were murdered, or the victims of a murder attempt, on their Web site, http://209.9.126.227/nafweb/violence/Chron_Murder.asp.

³ Arnold, Ron, *Ecoterror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature*, The Free Enterprise Press, Bellevue, Washington, 1997, pages 36-37.

⁴ The Justice Department communiqués, dated September 3, 1999, and October 24, 1999, are available through Frontline World News, www.environweb.org/ALFIS/news/archive.html.

⁵ National Animal Interest Alliance, www.naiaonline.org/body/articles/arterror.htm, dates to include May 23, 2001; February 23, 2001; February 21, 2001; February 13, 2001; February 12, 2001; February 4, 2001; January 31, 2001; January 22, 2001; January 10, 2001; and August 28, 2000.

⁶ Dyson, William E., *Terrorism: An Investigator's Handbook*, Anderson Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, 2001, page 24.

⁷ See ALF and ELF *Diary of Action*, as reflected in source one.

⁸ Rudolph was placed on the FBI's Ten Most Wanted Fugitive list for several bombing attacks, including the fatal attack on the New Woman All Women Health Care Clinic in Birmingham, Alabama, on January 29, 1998, wherein abortions were done.

⁹ Based on the number of attacks as indicated in source one.

¹⁰ Examples include the March 14, 1997, tree spiking at the Robinson-Scott timber harvest site in Oregon; the arson of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal Damage Control buildings, destroying \$1.5 million in research in Olympia, Washington, on June 21, 1998; and the release of 100 wild horses from the Bureau of Land Management's wild horse corrals in Rock Springs, Wyoming. Reflected on ELF's Web site, www.earthliberationfront.com/doa/.

¹¹ Including the million-dollar arson of the U.S. Forest Service's Biotechnology Laboratory in Rhinelander, Wisconsin, on July 21, 2000, and the arson at the Michigan State University office of Catherine Ives on December 31, 1999—claimed via communiqués reflected on ELF's Web site, www.earthliberationfront.com.

¹² There are several articles concerning genetic engineering and cloning carried on the antiabortion Web site of the Missionaries to the Unborn, www.mttu.com/main.htm.

¹³ *American Heritage Dictionary*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1982.

¹⁴ The video is entitled *Igniting the Revolution: An Introduction to the Earth Liberation Front* and is promoted via ELF's Web site, www.earthliberationfront.com.

¹⁵ *Black Bloc for Dummies*, Infoshop, www.infoshop.org/blackbloc.html—described as “your online anarchist community”—provides insight on how anarchist black blocs function.

¹⁶ *Time*, July 23, 2001, page 36.

¹⁷ *The Associated Press*, Monday, April 2, 2001, and *The Oregonian*, Saturday, March 31, 2001, page D03.